

PUBLIC HEARING - JULY 23, 2020

ITEM 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT BY-LAW TO INCREASE RENTAL HOUSING IN THE C-2, C-2B, C-2C, AND C-2C1 COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Attachment
06/23/2020	15:17	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	I oppose the amendment to the zoning development bylaw to allow 6 stories instead of 4. This item requires more public input.	Gordon Ross	No web attachments.
06/23/2020	15:57	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	As a renter in Vancouver, I am increasingly aware of the disappearing sky (not to mention decreased privacy created by large developments on main streets) in our neighbourhoods. Four stories should be the maximum height in all C-2 zones.	Cathryn McGuire	No web attachments.
06/25/2020	17:55	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Without full neighbourhood Consultation on the matter of rejoining of this magnitude...I oppose proceeding during this pandemic period!	Bonnie Spence	No web attachments.
07/03/2020	11:51	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	Not consistent with larger plan from mid 90's which includes supports for duplexes, triplexes and row housing in these zones.	John Peters	No web attachments.
07/16/2020	13:07	PH2 - 3. Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to Increase Rental Housing in the C-2, C-2B, C-2C, and C-2C1 Commercial Districts	Oppose	To Vancouver City Council: When I attended the display of this building earlier at Van Dusen Gardens, I was not impressed with the architecture of the building for this area. I was also not impressed that it would be a wooden structure. I realize all this comes under ?affordable housing?, however nothing in this area is going to be affordable. I am not against apartment buildings, the apartment on Laurier and Oak is a fine example of a classic style apartment for this area. There are many reasons why this building in this area is not appropriate. Traffic congestion with regards to parking, both on the street and under the building where access is from an alley way that is not exactly roomy. The parking on Granville St. is restricted at certain times. This location is not close to any shopping. It is close to bus stops but that is the only advantage. This style of architecture would stand out like a sore thumb in this area. This area is very much large older homes that have a history for Vancouver. It would be a shame to start putting unsuitable apartments in this area and take away from the history of this area. There are so many areas in this city where new apartments that are more affordable are being planned, and in most of them there are other amenities that are offered to make it all more suitable and convenient. A few examples are the Arbutus development, the proposed First Nations apartments near Granville Island, Oakridge Centre, Cambie and 59th , just to name a few on the west side. Before I close I would like to remind the City of Vancouver of the land in the Little Mountain area that was supposed to create a large amount of affordable housing. What is happening with this? are we going to see some development there or not? Sincerely, Barbara Dohm	Barbara Dohm	No web attachments.